

CS. TÖTTÖSSY

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREEK AND LATIN ACC. AND NOM. C. INF.

A historico-typological analysis of Greek and Latin infinitival structures, and that of Greek and Latin *accusativi cum infinitivis*, and *nominativi cum infinitivis* does not only mean the clearer understanding of the syntactical system of the languages concerned, but it can also elucidate the emergence and the development of these structures.

The views published so far regarding the development of structures with *accusativus cum infinitivo* and *nominativus cum infinitivo* in Greek and Latin can be divided into two groups. We can say that one of the conceptions belongs to the Greek and Latin linguists and the other to the Indo-European comparative philologists.

The opinions of the Greek and Latin linguists are also summarized by the great handbooks in the Greek Grammar of Schwyzler<sup>1</sup> and in the Latin Grammar of Stolz – Schmalz – Leumann – Hofmann – Szantyr<sup>2</sup>, but Ernout<sup>3</sup> and others<sup>4</sup> are also of the same opinion. Their conception is as follows:

The *accusativus cum infinitivo* developed beside the *verba iubendi*, that is the verbs meaning instructing, ordering, commanding. They draw the attention to the circumstance that the original government of these is «I instruct s o m e o n e to do something», therefore the personal object: the accusative and the infinitive beside them is comprehensible, as in the following sentences: *iubeo te abire* or *κελεύω σε ἰέναι*. As one of the stages of development they mention the structures *doceo te litteras* and *doceo te scribere*, in which we also find two accusatives. They are correct in saying that in these structures with *accusativus cum infinitivo* the *accusativus* is the object of the *verbum regens*, and the relation of this accusative to the action of the infinitive appears to be subjective. In the course of time the language came to feel only this subjective function and this is how that structure developed into another one in which the accusative became the subject of the infinitive, and, on the one hand, the *accusativus cum infinitivo* occurs already not only with the *verba iubendi*, but also with the *verba sentiendi* and *dicendi*, while, on the other hand, the accusative is not necessarily the object of the *verbum regens*, thus the

sentences «*Oportet milites fortiter pugnare*» or τούς στρατιώτας μάχεσθαι δίκαιόν ἐστι are also possible.

The opinion of Indo-European comparative philologists is expounded by Hirt<sup>5</sup>. He regards it as impossible that the *accusativus cum infinitivo* would have developed in Greek and Latin in such a late period, when the nominative and accusative differed already unmistakably from each other. In his opinion the *accusativus cum infinitivo* developed earlier, in the Indo-European period, when the nominative and the accusative were still identical and morphologically they did not differ from each other, and when the infinitive still could be used as a verbal form, otherwise he believes that the development of this structure is not to be explained.

In our opinion the following facts should be taken into consideration:

In the Indo-European languages the infinitive had earlier numerous variants. In the Vedic language we can find still about one hundred infinitive forms<sup>6</sup>. While, however, in the other Indo-European languages the number of the infinitives decreased, and thus in Classical Sanskrit we can find already only one infinitive, namely the type *śro-tum*, in Greek and Latin their number increased. As we see, this numerical increase is explained by the fact that in Greek and Latin the increase in number of the infinitives is rendered necessary exactly by the *accusativus cum infinitivo*.

The infinitives have two types<sup>7</sup>. One of them completely fits into the verbal system, thus it completely adjusts itself to the *genus* and *actio* systems of the verb, while the other does not do so, and it is not formed from the imperfect stem or the perfect one, but from the verbal root itself, like in the Latin supine with suffix *-tum*. We can say that the infinitive system adapted to the *genus* and *actio* system of the verb developed in reality only in Greek and Latin, where the system of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* also developed.

In connection with the two explanations mentioned above we remark as follows:

Hirt — at least in the case of the accusative — very correctly thinks that we must take the changes of cases into consideration. However, he does not explain that when the nominative and accusative got formally separated from each other, why did this change not take place also in the *accusativus cum infinitivo*? Further, he does not think about the fact either that, although this accusative in its relationship to the infinitive has the role of a subject, it is still not a subject, and it is not the subject of the sentence. Thus, there is no reason why this should be in nominative. In our opinion its appearance in nominative can only be brought about by the *verbum regens*, exactly as it occurs also in the case of the *nominativus cum infinitivo*.

As regards the other explanation, the «*te scribere*» beside *doceo* is not an *accusativus cum infinitivo*, when it has the meaning «I teach you to write». From this structure will be come never an *accusativus cum infinitivo*. This will become an *accusativus cum infinitivo* only in such a case when it has the meaning «I demonstrate, that you are writing». In the



first case the *scribere* forms a syntagm with the *doceo* and the *scribere* does not belong and does not even relate to the *te*. Thus it does not form a structure with the latter, but in such cases the *scribere* is — according to the term used by me — the adverb of purpose of the *doceo* (which is an adverb of the *finalis* type, cp. this with the *dativus finalis*). Thus — in our opinion — the use of the type *doceo te scribere* as a step to the development of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* is not correct.

However in our opinion the structure with *κελεύω* or *iubeo* is too clear to become rigid and, on the other hand, it governs another infinitival *actio*-system than those after the *verba dicendi*. In fact the type of *accusativus cum infinitivo* with *infinitivus perfectus* could never have developed from it beside the *verba iubendi*. As a matter of fact, in Latin only *infinitivus imperfectus* can stand after the *verba iubendi*, while the *verba sentiendi et dicendi* govern a system of *accusativus cum infinitivo* with three aspects. The situation is even more interesting in Greek. Here not only *infinitivus imperfectus* but also *infinitivus aoristi* can stand after the *κελεύω*. However, while after the *verba iubendi* the *infinitivus aoristi* is of instant meaning, after the *verba dicendi* the *infinitivus aoristi* is of antecedent meaning.<sup>8</sup> Thus we must differentiate between the *accusativi cum infinitivis* after the two groups of verbs already on account of this, although this has not been thought necessary by anybody so far.

Thus, the system of *accusativus cum infinitivo* with three aspects in Latin and with four aspects in Greek could not have developed from the structure of *accusativus cum infinitivo* with *κελεύω* and *iubeo*, which is just the characteristic feature of the system of *accusativus cum infinitivo* in Greek and Latin.

However, from the viewpoint of the explanation of the development of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* that fact is most important which up to now has been disregarded and has not been utilized in the explanation of its development. This fact is that although the infinitives of Greek and Latin are used with nominative and accusative values in classical Greek and Latin, these infinitives according to their origin have the suffixes of locative or dative, in both languages, as it is generally known. Let us still sum up the ways of the formation of the infinitives!

The Latin<sup>9</sup> *infinitivus imperfectus activi* consists of the imperfect root, the nominal suffix *-s-* and the locative termination *-ī*, e. g. *gaudēre* < \**gaudē-s-ī* [between the two vowels the *s* becomes *r* and the terminal *-ī* becomes *ē* (like in the case of the *mare* or *ante* (~ *ἀντί*) or in the case of the *pede*, where the *-ē* is also a locative *-ī* in the ablative)], in the same way *capere* < \**capi-s-ī*, where before the *r ī* becomes *ē* (cp. *cinis*, *cineris*), and similarly *esse* < \**es-s-ī*, while *velle* < \**vel-s-ī* (with the assimilation of the *s*). The equivalent of this formation of infinitive in Vedic Old Indian is the infinitive form *śro-ṣ-ī*.

The *infinitivus imperfectus passivi* consists of the imperfect root, the nominal suffix *-s-* and the dative termination *-ī* (< *-ai/-ei*, e. g. *Apollinei*), e. g. *laudāri* < \**laudā-s-ī*, its equivalent in Vedic is the infinitive form

*jīva-s-e*, while in the 3rd conjugation the dative termination *-ī* is added to the imperfect root directly, without the nominal suffix *-s-*, e. g. *vert-ī* (its equivalent in Vedic is the infinitive form *vrt-e*) and *cap-ī*.

In the *infinitivus perfectus activi* we also find the locative termination *-ī*, e. g. *laudav-is-s-e* (perfect root, aorist suffix *-is-*, nominal suffix *-s-*, locative suffix *-ī > -ē*).

All things considered, in the *infinitivus perfectus passivi* having a compound form (e. g. *laudatus esse*), we can also find the *esse* formed with the locative suffix, just like in the *infinitivus instans activi*, which originally could also have been used in the form without *esse*. In the case of the *infinitivus instans passivi* (e. g. *laudatum īrī*, actually meaning «to go into praising») in the *īrī* we find the dative termination.

The Greek<sup>10</sup> infinitives can also be traced back to locative forms or have the termination *-αι*, which however have to be regarded as having the dative termination.

The vanished locative termination *-ī* was added to the corresponding root with the nominal suffix *-sen-*: *φέρειν < \*φερε-σεν-ι*, *τιμᾶν < \*τιμαε-σεν-ι* (attached to the imperfect root), *λπείν* (them. strong aor.), *παιδεύσ-ειν* and *στελεῖν* (*< \*στελ-εσ-ειν*) futures). Its equivalent in Vedic is *bhū-ṣan-ī*.

The termination *-αι* (which can also be found for example in the *χαμνί*) can be added to the nominal suffix *-s-* (cp. the Vedic *jīva-s-e*), e. g. *δεῖξαι < \*δεικ-σ-αι*, *παιδεῖσθαι*, *στεῖλαι < \*στελ-σ-αι* (act. aorists), it can be added to the nominal suffix *-n-*, e. g. *δεικνύ-ν-αι*, *διδό-ν-αι*, *εἶναι*, *εἰδέναι*, *ιέναι* (act. imperf.-s), *παιδενθῆ-ναι* and *γοαφῆ-ναι* (weak and strong passive aorists), as well as *πεπαιδευκέναι* and *γεγοαφέναι* (weak and strong medio-pass. perf.-s), it can be added to the nominal suffix *-wen-* (cp. Ved. *dā-van-e*), e. g. *δοῦναι < \*δο-Fer-αι* (act. aor.), it can be added to the nominal suffix *-men-* (cp. Ved. *dā-man-e*), e. g. Hom. *δό-μεν-αι*, *ἔμ-μεν-αι*. (In the case of the latter ones there are examples also for the vanishing of the locative termination *-ī* in the case of the forms *δό-μεν* and *ἔμ-μεν*.)

The termination of the medial infinitives is always *-σθαί*, and in this Hirt<sup>11</sup> similarly sees a dative form.

Thus, since the Latin and Greek infinitives have locative and dative terminations, we have to explain the transformation and development of the locative and dative into accusative and nominative. Let us attempt to do so!

In the sentence «*Video patrem gaudentem*» the «*gaudentem*» has to be accusative. The «*patrem gaudentem*» is an *accusativus cum participio*, or a *participium coniunctum*. The participle is here morphologically an accusative, but from the syntactical point of view it is an adverbial complement. I call this adverbial complement an adverbial modifier of state. The characteristic feature and essence of this adverbial modifier of state is that, like the other adverbial complements, it belongs to a verb, but at the same time the modifier of state always relates to a noun. Besides the



*participium coniunctum*, such adverbial modifiers of state are the *attributum praedicativum* and the *appositio praedicativa*, as well as the the second accusative of the double accusative (beside *nomino* etc.). The fact that this adverbial modifier relates to a noun, is reflected in the Indo-European languages by the circumstance that it stands in identical case, number and gender with the noun, just like the attribute but, of course, it is not yet an attribute, because the attribute not only relates to a noun but entirely belongs to it and has nothing to do with the verb. (It is to be noted that this appearance in the form of an attribute is exactly missing from Hungarian, my mother tongue.).

But this adverbial complement that is *gaudentem* can also be expressed in another way. The sentence «I see the father rejoicing» can also be expressed in this way: «I see the father in joy, in his joy». This could be said in Latin so that from the verbal root *gaudē-* a noun is formed with the suffix *-s-*, this will be *gaudē-s-*, and to this the locative suffix *-ī* is added, thus we get the form *gaudē-s-ī*, from which the *gaudēre* developed.

Thus, the «*video patrem gaudentem*» and the «*video patrem gaudere*» are essentially equivalent sentences. However, the locative character of the form *gaudere* has vanished from the general consciousness of the language, because 1) the locative case has almost completely vanished (just like in Greek), in Latin and 2) because the locative suffix *-ī*, which was transformed into an *-ē* in Latin (and vanished in Greek), became unrecognizable as a locative suffix. Thus, the one who values (very correctly) the form «*gaudentem*» of the «*video patrem gaudentem*» as an accusative, begins to value the form «*gaudere*» equivalent with this — and similarly having the function of an adverbial modifier of state — also as an accusative. At the same time a structure develops, takes root and petrifies, namely the *accusativus cum infinitivo*. The essence of this structure will already be actually that in it the accusative, which originally was merely the object of the *verbum regens* that is of the sentence (while the infinitive was its adverbial complement of state, which belonged to the *verbum regens* and was related to the accusative), is of subjective character in relation to the infinitive, because the action of the verb in infinitive is performed by the noun in accusative case.

After the petrification of this structure already the whole *accusativus cum infinitivo* becomes actually the object of the *verbum regens*, and not only the nominal accusative (the *patrem*), as the case had originally been. This petrification is needed to achieve that the *accusativus cum infinitivo* may stand beside intransitive verbs also as a subject.

Similarly, in the sentence *videtur pater gaudens* the adverbial modifier of state *gaudens* is a nominative, and therefore in the sentence *videtur pater gaudere* the language can value also this infinitive as a nominative, although originally the *gaudere* was also here a *locativus infinitivi*, similarly in the function of an adverbial modifier of state.

The situation is the same also in Greek. In the sentence ὁρῶ τὸν πατέρα χαίροντα the χαίροντα is an accusative with the function of an adverbial modifier of state, and similarly to this the infinitive of the sen-

tence λέγονσι τὸν πατέρα χαίρειν — being an adverbial modifier of state — is valued by the language as an accusative, and if the *verbum regens* becomes passive, since in this case the adverbial modifier of state relates to the subject of the sentence, the infinitive originally being of locative form, is valued as a nominative. In Greek, as compared with Latin, the only difference is that after the *verba sentiendi* an *accusativus cum participio* is used and the *accusativus cum infinitivo* develops in the way described above only after the *verba dicendi*.

In Old Indian, on the other hand, the sentence with *accusativus cum participio* of the type *paśyāmi pitaram bhuñjantam* corresponding to the aforesaid, did not develop any structure with *accusativus cum infinitivo*. This is the reason why of the numerous infinitives of the Vedic language already one will be sufficient in Classical Sanskrit.

But the *accusativus cum infinitivo* after the *verba sentiendi et dicendi* demands that the *accusativus cum infinitivo* should be applicable in each *actio* and *genus* of the verb, and thus the system of infinitives must fully develop in these two languages. In this infinitival system the infinitive forms develop in several ways. One of the ways of the development is for example that of the Greek medial infinitives, in the case of which always a suffix -σθαί is added to the root of the corresponding aspect. The other way is that, since two infinitives lose the sense of difference from each other, one of them gets utilized in another aspect or genus.

Thus interesting is the case in connection with the Latin infinitive *laudārī*. In fact, this does not differ from the infinitive *laudāre* in anything else than that the former shows the dative suffix, while the latter has the locative suffix. In our opinion this was necessary in the beginning because this infinitive with dative suffix appeared beside the *verba iubendi* as a *finalis*. We attempt to explain the development of the use of the infinitive of the form *laudārī* which has a passive value.

The passive value of this infinitive has developed in a sentence of such a type: *Brutus filios ligari iussit*. Originally the *ligari* did not mean anything more than «for binding», because there is no sign of its being passive. Thus *filios* can be its object, and the sentence could once mean «Brutus instructed (gave instruction) for the binding of his sons». The given instruction is expressed here with infinitive in dative form, just like in Greek (where παιδεῦσαι is the corresponding infinitive form). The *filios* cannot be the object of the *verbum iubendi*, because Brutus does not instruct his sons to do this binding and he does not instruct them either to become bound. This is why we regard this as a former object beside the *ligari* having once an active value. Since, however, the linguistic perception and valuation are formed according to which in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* the action of the infinitive is performed by the accusative standing beside it (therefore we could call this an *accusativus subiectivus* on the analogy of the denomination *genitivus subiectivus*, because, of course, the *genitivus subiectivus* is no subject either but it only has a subjective role), thus this sentence is also valued by the language that the performer of the action *ligari* is the *filios*, that is the accusative stand-



ing beside the *ligari* (but this *filios* had been the active object of an active *ligari* in the first times). However the *filios* can only perform this doing role if we ascribe a subjective role of passive value to it. For this, however, the language has to give a passive meaning also to the infinitive *ligari*. Thus this structure will become an *accusativus cum infinitivo* of full value, because the *filios* will receive a subjective role in relation to the *ligari*. However, the sentence of this type also explains how the infinitive of the type *ligari* became passive, the explanation of which was difficult till now.<sup>12</sup>

In Greek the infinitive with the suffix *-σαι* which has a dative suffix, went over to the aorist with the suffix *-σα-* on the basis of the similarity of their forms. Thus, beside the verbs of the type and meaning *πελεῖω* the infinitives with suffix *-αι* can be used ever in an active sense and the infinitives with the termination *-αι* are used more frequently beside the *verba iubendi* than the infinitives with the termination *-ειν*. At the same time, as we have already mentioned, beside the *verba dicendi* the same *infinitivus aoristi* in Greek has not an instant value but a past, an antecedent value.<sup>13</sup> The duality of its meaning results — in our opinion — from the origin of its form and mainly from that fact, that the *infinitivus aoristi* beside the *verba dicendi* stands instead of *praeteritum indicativi aoristi* of *oratio recta*, and the *infinitivus aoristi* beside the *verba iubendi* stands instead of the *imperativus aoristi*, which expresses an order, which has to be carried out immediately in the case of the *oratio recta*).

Thus, we explain above the development of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* system with four aspects in Greek and with three aspects in Latin exactly from the structures beside the *verba sentiendi et dicendi* with the help of a structure of another type but of identical value that is with the help of the *accusativus cum participio*.

<sup>1</sup> E. Schwyzler: Griechische Grammatik. II. Vervollständigt u. hgg. v. A. Debrunner. München 1950. 372 ff.

<sup>2</sup> J. B. Hofmann — A. Szantyr: Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik. München 1965. 353 ff.

<sup>3</sup> A. Ernout — F. Thomas: Syntax Latine. Paris 1972<sup>2</sup>. 320.

<sup>4</sup> R. Kühner — C. Stegmann: Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre. I. Teil. München 1962. 687 ff.; A. Meillet — J. Vendryes: Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques. Paris 1968<sup>4</sup>. 622 foll.

<sup>5</sup> H. Hirt: Indogermanische Grammatik. Teil VI. Heidelberg 1934. 191 foll. and Teil VII. Heidelberg 1937. 114 ff.

<sup>6</sup> W. D. Whitney: Sanskrit Grammar. Delhi — Varanasi — Patna 1969. 349 ff.; T. Burrow: The Sanskrit Language. London 1955. 364 ff. and H. Hirt: Indogermanische Grammatik. IV. 92 foll.

<sup>7</sup> H. Hirt: Indogermanische Grammatik. IV. 90 foll.

<sup>8</sup> Beside the *verba dicendi* in case of synchrony *infinitivus imperfectus*, in case of posteriority *infinitivus futurus*, and in case anteriority *infinitivus aoristi* (e.g. Πάντες ὁμολογοῦσι Περικλέα προστάτην τῆς πόλεως ὄντα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις αἴτιον μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν γ' εἶσθαι) *Infinitivus* is used *perfectus* can also be — used of course, in the sense of a *perfectum logicum* — that is in the case of the existence of the state after taking place of the action, thus, as a matter of fact to express synchrony. After the *verba iubendi* only the *infinitivus imperfectus* and the *infinitivus aoristi* can be used. In such cases, however, the *infinitivus aoristi* does not express anteriority, since in fact the phrase "I order that you

went" cannot even be said, but here we use logically posteriority, since, after all, I do not order that had been, and not even that already is, but only what is going to be. In this case both the *infinitivus imperfectus* and the *infinitivus aoristi* are logically used for the expression of posteriority, namely, in our opinion, the *infinitivus imperfectus* is used if the action ordered is prolonged or it is a repeated action (e.g. *Καὶ τότε ἐκέλευον σοὶ διδόναι τὰρεστέα τοὺς στρατηγούς*) and the *infinitivus aoristi* if the action ordered is single, instantaneous (e.g. *Κύροσ Κλεόρχῳ παρήγγειλεν ὥς τάχιστα εἰς Σάρδεϊς ἐλθεῖν* or *Μιλτιάδης τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔπεισε στρατεῦσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς Περσίους*). In this case the predicate of the imperative sentence, when it has the form of *oratio recta*, is in *imperativus aoristi* (in the case of the order, which has to be carried out immediately), and the predicate of the imperative sentence is in *imperativus imperfectus* (in the case of the order, which has to be carried out not immediately, e.g. in sentence *Καὶ τότε . . . διδόναι . . .*).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. regarding the formation of the infinitive in Latin: F. Sommer: *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg 1902. 630 ff.; И. М. Тронский: *Историческая грамматика латинского языка*. Москва 1960. 243 foll., 270, 286 foll., 288; Meillet – Vendryes: *op. cit.* 356 ff.; L. R. Palmer: *The Latin Language*. London 1974. 278 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. regarding the formation of the infinitive in Greek: H. Hirt: *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg 1902. 431 ff.; W. Brandenstein: *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. II. Berlin 1959. 108, 112; Meillet – Vendryes: *op. cit.* 340 ff.; B. F. C. Atkinson: *The Greek Language*. London 1952. 94, 98.

<sup>11</sup> H. Hirt: *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. 431, 433; and see above the note 10.

<sup>12</sup> For this we can also mention an analogy regarding the formation of the object beside the *infinitivus instans passivi* in Latin. In the sentence *litteras meas prius tibi redditum iri putabam* only the *iri* was the object of the active *putabam*, and the *redditum* was the adverbial complement of the *iri*, while the *litteras* was the object of the active *redditum*. Thus, originally this meant "I thought the going of my letter into an earlier delivery to you". For us, however, this whole appears already to be a complete *accusativus cum infinitivo*, and we value it that the *litteras* is the *accusativus* of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* and the *redditum iri* is its infinitive.

<sup>13</sup> The *indicativus aoristi* has a past value in the *oratio recta* (without *verba dicendi*), and therefore also the *infinitivus aoristi* has past value in the case of the *oratio obliqua*.